



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/817,252 03/27/01 ASAO

Y 063136

MM91/0829
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLL
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

TAMAI, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED:

08/29/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,252

Applicant(s)

ASAO ET AL.

Examiner

Tamai IE Karl

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/065,571.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2834

Atty Dkt: Q63136

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figures 10 and 11 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
3. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification, such as page 1, second paragraph the Randell-type rotor is a Lundell-type rotor or a claw-pole rotor. The examiner does not know of any type of rotor called a Randell-type.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 8-15 are vague and indefinite because they depend from cancelled claims 1 and 2. For the purposes of advancing prosecution on

Art Unit: 2834

Atty Dkt: Q63136

the merits, the examiner will assume that the claims depend from claims 7 and 8 respectively. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the sides of the magnetic portions". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima et al.(Tajima)(JP 54116610) and Saval et al.(Saval)(US 5325003). Tajima teaches a claw pole rotor with opposing claw poles 4,6 around a coil 5 and a plurality of magnetic portions (adhesive and ferrite powder) between adjacent poles which abut the coil. The surface of the magnetic portion contacting the poles forming molded fitted portions which prevent radial movement of the magnetic members. The molded portion contacting the tips of the poles prevent axial shifting of the magnetic members. Tajima does not teach the coil having a bobbin with opposing flanges and the magnetic portion being resin with ferrite iron filings. Saval teaches a bobbin with opposing flange which abut the resin injected molded pole support 332. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the rotor of Tajima with the coil wound on a bobbin, as in Saval, to provide easy mount of the coil in the field pole.

Art Unit: 2834

Atty Dkt: Q63136

8. Claims 7-10, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotta et al.(JP 612-254,040)('040) and Hotta(JP 3-265,450)('450). '040 teaches a claw pole rotor with a resin bobbin and resin spacers, where the spacers abut the bobbin. The spacers include fitting portions 30-c extend from end to end on the poles to prevent both axial and radial movement. '040 does not teach magnetic material in the spacers. '450 teaches resin covers over magnetic material to reduce flux leakage. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the rotor of '040 with the magnetic material in the spacers(covers), as in '450, to reduce flux leakage.

9. Claims 11, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotta et al.(JP 612-254,040)('040) and Hotta(JP 3-265,450)('450), in further view of Burton (UK 2,074,795). Tajima and Saval teach every aspect of the invention except the magnetic portions being a resin with ferrite iron filings. Burton teaches that magnetic material in motors is made from resin with iron filings. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the rotor of '040 and '450 with magnetic portion being made from resin with iron filings because Burton teaches the resin is preferred because it can be molded into the shape of the core.

Art Unit: 2834

Atty Dkt: Q63136

10. Claims 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima et al.(Tajima)(JP 54116610) and Saval et al.(Saval)(US 5325003), in further Burton(UK 2,074,795). Tajima and Saval teach every aspect of the invention except the magnetic portions being a resin with ferrite iron filings. Burton teaches that magnetic material in motors is made from resin with iron filings. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the rotor of Tajima and Saval with magnetic portion being made from resin with iron filings because Burton teaches the resin is preferred because it can be molded into the shape of the core.

11. Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima et al.(Tajima)(JP 54116610) and Saval et al.(Saval)(US 5325003), in further Kusase et al.(Kusase)(US 5,483,116). Tajima and Saval teach every aspect of the invention except the bobbin made from resin. Kusase teaches the bobbin made from resin. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the rotor of Tajima and Saval with bobbin being made from resin because it is inexpensive to produce and easy to manufacture.

Art Unit: 2834

Atty Dkt: Q63136

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl I.E. Tamai whose telephone number is (703) 305-7066.

The examiner can be normally contacted on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Nestor Ramirez, can be reached at (703)308-1371. The facsimile number for the Group is (703)305-3432.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Karl I Tamai
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
August 28, 2001

Karl Tamai
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800